

REMARKS

Rejection of claims 5, 13-16 and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 13 over the term “automatic approval.” This term was removed from the claim. The term was unclear in the context of this claim and unnecessarily limiting.

The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 13 over the term “indicating status.” This term was amended to recite “the status of processing the second information.”

The Examiner rejected claims 13 and 18 for problems with antecedent basis. With regard to claim 13, applicants have amended the claim to recite “first information.” With regard to claim 18 applicants have amended the claim to recite “the first computer system” instead of “a first computer system.” The antecedent for “the first computer system” is “a first computer system” recited in the preamble of claim 18. Applicant’s believe the examiner meant to address the antecedent basis of these two elements as corrected herein. For example, the office action stated “the first computer system” had insufficient antecedent basis. But it appears the Examiner meant to say the term “a first computer system” in line 5 of claim 18 is incorrect when the element had already been introduced earlier.


Rejection of claims 1-4, 6-12 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan in view of Fitzsimons.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-12 and 17 as being unpatentable over Srinivasan in view of Fitzsimons. Applicants traverse the Examiner's finding of obviousness of the claims as amended. The cited art individually or in combination does not teach or suggest the claimed invention as amended herein. The claims have been amended according to the suggestions by the Examiner in the Fax of 07/01/04. The Applicant's thank the Examiner for the careful consideration of this application and the indication of allowable claims over the cited art. Applicants believe the claims are now in condition for allowance as indicated by the Examiner's action and preliminary fax.

Conclusion

In summary, none of the cited prior art, either alone or in combination, teach, support, or suggest the unique combination of features in applicants' claims presently on file. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that all of applicants' claims are allowable. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if this would in any way advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Bret J. Petersen
Reg. No. 37,417

MARTIN & ASSOCIATES, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 548
Carthage, MO 64836-0548
(417) 358-4700